

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 8 has been amended. Claims 2 and 11-20 have been withdrawn from further consideration. The specification has been amended to correct certain informalities. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-10 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the drain regions of the transistors of the R, G and B unit pixels include offset regions. This amendment is made for the sole purpose of clarifying claim 8. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 8.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Application No. 2001-109399 of Yamada ("Yamada"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G and B unit pixels have drain regions of different geometric structures

Applicants respectfully submit that Yamada fails to teach or suggest at least such features. To the contrary, Yamada teaches transistors having different sizes, where transistor size refers to the ratio of channel width W to channel length L (where $L = L_1 + L_2$). Hence, Yamada teaches thin film transistors having different sized channels. Furthermore, while Yamada's Figure 1 shows the transistors of the blue (B), red (R), and green (G) pixels having different sized channels, it also appears to show substantially identical drain regions since the length of the active layer increases to accommodate the increased channel length. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamada fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G and B unit pixels have *drain regions* of different geometric structures" (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action appears to have mischaracterized Yamada in concluding that Yamada anticipates "wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G and B unit pixels have drain regions of different geometric structures." Specifically, in

the last line on page 2, the Office Action cites (43c, 43d) for drain regions. Yet, 43c is a channel, not a drain region.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1. Claims 3, 5-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,002,302 issued to Park ("Park"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 9 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Park is disqualified as prior art per 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

Statement Concerning Common Ownership

Application 10/815,792 and Patent No. U.S. 7,002,302 were, at the time the invention of Application 10/815,792 was made, owned by Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 9.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 20, 2006

Customer No. 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/RTS/tmk